

# Transformation of second-class into first-class constraints in supersymmetric theories

J. Barcelos-Neto<sup>\*</sup> and W. Oliveira<sup>†</sup>

Instituto de Física

Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro

RJ 21945-970 - Caixa Postal 68528 - Brasil

## Abstract

We use the method due to Batalin, Fradkin, Fradkina, and Tyutin (BFFT) in order to convert second-class into first-class constraints for some quantum mechanics supersymmetric theories. The main point to be considered is that the extended theory, where new auxiliary variables are introduced, has to be supersymmetric too. This leads to some additional restrictions with respect the conventional use of the BFFT formalism.

PACS: 03.65.-w, 11.10.Ef, 11.30.Pb

---

<sup>\*</sup>e-mail: barcelos@if.ufrj.br

<sup>†</sup>e-mail: wilson@fisica.ufjf.br – Permanent address: UFJF - Departamento de Física - Juiz de Fora, MG 36036-330

# 1 Introduction

The method developed in series of papers by Batalin, Fradkin, Fradkina, and Tyutin (BFFT) [1, 2] has as main purpose the transformation of second-class into first-class constraints [3]. This is achieved with the aid of auxiliary fields that extend the phase space in a convenient way. After that, one has a gauge-invariant system which matches the original theory when the so-called unitary gauge is chosen.

The BFFT method is quite elegant and operates systematically. One application we could immediately envisage for it is the covariant quantization of systems with the Green-Schwarz (GS) supersymmetry [4]. In these systems, the existence of the  $\kappa$ -symmetry [5] inhibits a covariant separation of first and second-class constraints. The use of the method there would transform the second-class constraints into first-class and one could operate with them in the conventional way. However, this might not be an easy and simple task as one may confirm by looking at the works of covariant quantization of superstrings [6]. We intend that there are some problems that should be solved first. One of the crucial question is how the BFFT method can operate consistently in supersymmetric theories. This is a pertinent question because when the phase space is extended by introducing auxiliary variables a new theory is obtained, and this must also be supersymmetric.

The purpose of the present paper is to address the BFFT method to this particular problem related to supersymmetric theories. We show that the freedom we have in choosing some parameters in the application of the method can be conveniently used in order that a final supersymmetric theory should be verified. We consider two examples in supersymmetric quantum mechanics and we show that the method is only consistently applied when an infinite number of first-class constraints is introduced.

Our paper is organized as follows. In Sec. 2 we make a brief review of the BFFT method in order to emphasize and clarify some of its particularities that we shall use in the forthcoming sections. In Sec. 3 we consider one of the simplest supersymmetric quantum mechanical model, where the supersymmetric space is described by just one time and one Grassmannian variable. This system does not permit us to introduce interaction and has to be analyzed with bosons and fermions disconnected. In Sec. 4 we consider a more realistic model where it is possible to have interactions between bosons and fermions. This system is described in a space with one time and two Grassmannian variables. Finally, Sec. 5 contains some concluding remarks and we also introduce an appendix in order to explain some details concerning the choice of the extended space.

## 2 Brief review of the BFFT formalism

Let us consider a system described by a Hamiltonian  $H_0$  in a phase-space  $(q^i, p^i)$  with  $i = 1, \dots, N$ . Here we suppose that the coordinates are bosonic (extension to include fermionic degrees of freedom and to the continuous case can be done in a straightforward way). It is also supposed that there just exist second-class constraints (at the end of this section we refer to the case where first-class constraints are also present). Denoting them by  $T_a$ , with  $a = 1, \dots, M < 2N$ , we have

$$\{T_a, T_b\} = \Delta_{ab}, \quad (2.1)$$

where  $\det(\Delta_{ab}) \neq 0$ .

The general purpose of the BFFT formalism is to convert second-class constraints into first-class ones. This is achieved by introducing canonical variables, one for each second-class constraint (the connection between the number of second-class constraints and the new variables in a one-to-one correlation is to keep the same number of the physical degrees of freedom in the resulting extended theory). We denote these auxiliary variables by  $y^a$  and assume that they have the following general structure

$$\{y^a, y^b\} = \omega^{ab}, \quad (2.2)$$

where  $\omega^{ab}$  is a constant quantity with  $\det(\omega^{ab}) \neq 0$ . The obtainment of  $\omega^{ab}$  is discussed in what follows. It is embodied in the calculation of the resulting first-class constraints that we denote by  $\tilde{T}_a$ . Of course, these depend on the new variables  $y^a$ , namely

$$\tilde{T}_a = \tilde{T}_a(q, p; y), \quad (2.3)$$

and satisfy the boundary condition

$$\tilde{T}_a(q, p; 0) = \tilde{T}_a(q, p). \quad (2.4)$$

Another characteristic of these new constraints is that they are assumed to be strongly involutive, i.e.

$$\{\tilde{T}_a, \tilde{T}_b\} = 0. \quad (2.5)$$

The solution of (2.5) can be achieved by considering  $\tilde{T}_a$  expanded as

$$\tilde{T}_a = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} T_a^{(n)}, \quad (2.6)$$

where  $T_a^{(n)}$  is a term of order  $n$  in  $y$ . Compatibility with the boundary condition (2.4) requires that

$$T_a^{(0)} = T_a. \quad (2.7)$$

The replacement of (2.6) into (2.5) leads to a set of equations, one for each coefficient of  $y^n$ . We list some of them below

$$\{T_a^{(0)}, T_b^{(0)}\}_{(q,p)} + \{T_a^{(1)}, T_b^{(1)}\}_{(y)} = 0, \quad (2.8)$$

$$\{T_a^{(0)}, T_b^{(1)}\}_{(q,p)} + \{T_a^{(1)}, T_b^{(0)}\}_{(q,p)} + \{T_a^{(1)}, T_b^{(2)}\}_{(y)} + \{T_a^{(2)}, T_b^{(1)}\}_{(y)} = 0, \quad (2.9)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \{T_a^{(0)}, T_b^{(2)}\}_{(q,p)} + \{T_a^{(1)}, T_b^{(1)}\}_{(q,p)} + \{T_a^{(2)}, T_b^{(0)}\}_{(q,p)} + \{T_a^{(1)}, T_b^{(3)}\}_{(y)} \\ + \{T_a^{(2)}, T_b^{(2)}\}_{(y)} + \{T_a^{(3)}, T_b^{(1)}\}_{(y)} = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

$\vdots$

These correspond to coefficients of the powers  $y^0, y^1, y^2, \dots$ , respectively. The notation used above,  $\{, \}_{(q,p)}$  and  $\{, \}_{(y)}$ , represents the parts of the Poisson bracket  $\{, \}$  relative to the variables  $(q, p)$  and  $(y)$ .

Equations above are used iteratively in the obtainment of the corrections  $T^{(n)}$  ( $n \geq 1$ ). Equation (2.8) shall give  $T^{(1)}$ . With this result and (2.9), one calculates  $T^{(2)}$ , and so on. Since  $T^{(1)}$  is linear in  $y$  we may write

$$T_a^{(1)} = X_{ab}(q, p) y^b. \quad (2.11)$$

Introducing this expression into (2.8) and using the boundary condition (2.4), as well as (2.1) and (2.2), we get

$$\Delta_{ab} + X_{ac} \omega^{cd} X_{bd} = 0. \quad (2.12)$$

We notice that this equation does not give  $X_{ab}$  univocally, because it also contains the still unknown  $\omega^{ab}$ . What we usually do is to choose  $\omega^{ab}$  in such a way that the new variables are unconstrained. It is opportune to mention that it is not always possible to make a choice like this, that is to say, just having unconstrained variables [7]. In consequence, the consistency of the method requires an introduction of other new variables in order to transform these constraints also into first-class. This may lead to an endless process. However, it is important to emphasize that  $\omega^{ab}$  can be fixed anyway.

After fixing  $\omega^{ab}$ , we pass to consider the coefficients  $X_{ab}$ . They are also not obtained in a univocally way. Even after fixing  $\omega^{ab}$ , expression (2.12) leads to less equations than variables. The choice of  $X$ 's has to be done in a convenient way [8]. We shall see in the following sections how to use this freedom in order to keep the supersymmetry in the final theory.

The knowledge of  $X_{ab}$  permits us to obtain  $T_a^{(1)}$ . If  $X_{ab}$  do not depend on  $(q, p)$ , it is easily seen that  $T_a + T_a^{(1)}$  is already strongly involutive. When this occurs, we succeed in obtaining  $\tilde{T}_a$ . If this is not so, we have to introduce  $T_a^{(1)}$  into equation (2.9) to calculate  $T_a^{(2)}$ , and so on.

Another point in the BFFT formalism is that any dynamic function  $A(q, p)$  (for instance, the Hamiltonian) has also to be properly modified in order to be strongly involutive with the first-class constraints  $\tilde{T}_a$ . Denoting the modified quantity by  $\tilde{A}(q, p; y)$ , we then have

$$\{\tilde{T}_a, \tilde{A}\} = 0. \quad (2.13)$$

In addition,  $\tilde{A}$  has also to satisfy the boundary condition

$$\tilde{A}(q, p; 0) = A(q, p). \quad (2.14)$$

The obtainment of  $\tilde{A}$  is similar to what was done to get  $\tilde{T}_a$ , that is to say, we consider an expansion like

$$\tilde{A} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} A^{(n)}, \quad (2.15)$$

where  $A^{(n)}$  is also a term of order  $n$  in  $y$ 's. Consequently, compatibility with (2.14) requires that

$$A^{(0)} = A. \quad (2.16)$$

The combination of (2.6), (2.13) and (2.15) gives

$$\{T_a^{(0)}, A^{(0)}\}_{(q,p)} + \{T_a^{(1)}, A^{(1)}\}_{(y)} = 0, \quad (2.17)$$

$$\{T_a^{(0)}, A^{(1)}\}_{(q,p)} + \{T_a^{(1)}, A^{(0)}\}_{(q,p)} + \{T_a^{(1)}, A^{(2)}\}_{(y)} + \{T_a^{(2)}, A^{(1)}\}_{(y)} = 0 \quad (2.18)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \{T_a^{(0)}, A^{(2)}\}_{(q,p)} + \{T_a^{(1)}, A^{(1)}\}_{(q,p)} + \{T_a^{(2)}, A^{(0)}\}_{(q,p)} + \{T_a^{(1)}, A^{(3)}\}_{(y)} \\ + \{T_a^{(2)}, A^{(2)}\}_{(y)} + \{T_a^{(3)}, A^{(1)}\}_{(y)} = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (2.19)$$

$\vdots$

which correspond to the coefficients of the powers  $y^0, y^1, y^2$ , etc., respectively. The expression (2.17) above gives us  $A^{(1)}$

$$A^{(1)} = -y^a \omega_{ab} X^{bc} \{T_c, A\}, \quad (2.20)$$

where  $\omega_{ab}$  and  $X^{ab}$  are the inverses of  $\omega^{ab}$  and  $X_{ab}$ .

In the obtainment of  $T_a^{(1)}$  we had seen that  $T_a + T_a^{(1)}$  was strongly involutive if the coefficients  $X_{ab}$  do not depend on  $(q, p)$ . However, the same argument does not necessarily apply here. Usually we have to calculate other corrections to obtain the final  $\tilde{A}$ . Let us discuss how this can be systematically done. We consider the general case first. The correction  $A^{(2)}$  comes from equation (2.18), that we conveniently rewrite as

$$\{T_a^{(1)}, A^{(2)}\}_{(y)} = -G_a^{(1)}, \quad (2.21)$$

where

$$G_a^{(1)} = \{T_a, A^{(1)}\}_{(q,p)} + \{T_a^{(1)}, A\}_{(q,p)} + \{T_a^{(2)}, A^{(1)}\}_{(y)}. \quad (2.22)$$

Thus

$$A^{(2)} = -\frac{1}{2} y^a \omega_{ab} X^{bc} G_c^{(1)}. \quad (2.23)$$

In the same way, other terms can be obtained. The final general expression reads

$$A^{(n+1)} = -\frac{1}{n+1} y^a \omega_{ab} X^{bc} G_c^{(n)}, \quad (2.24)$$

where

$$G_a^{(n)} = \sum_{m=0}^n \{T_a^{(n-m)}, A^{(m)}\}_{(q,p)} + \sum_{m=0}^{n-2} \{T_a^{(n-m)}, A^{(m+2)}\}_{(y)} + \{T_a^{(n+1)}, A^{(1)}\}_{(y)}. \quad (2.25)$$

For the particular case when  $X_{ab}$  do not depend on  $(q, p)$  we have that the corrections  $A^{(n+1)}$  can be obtained by the same expression (2.24), but  $G_a^{(n)}$  simplifies to

$$G_a^{(n)} = \{T_a, A^{(n)}\}_{(q,p)}. \quad (2.26)$$

At this stage, it is opportune to mention that when  $X_{ab}$  do not depend on  $(q, p)$  and the second-class constraints are linear in the phase-space variables, there is an alternative and more direct way of calculating the modified function  $\tilde{A}$  [9]. Let us briefly discuss how this can be done. The combination of (2.24) and (2.26) gives

$$\begin{aligned} A^{(n+1)} &= -\frac{1}{n+1} y^a \omega_{ab} X^{bc} \{T_c, A^{(n)}\}_{(q,p)}, \\ &= -\frac{1}{n+1} y^a \omega_{ab} X^{bc} \{T_c, \Omega^\alpha\} \frac{\partial A^{(n)}}{\partial \Omega^\alpha}, \\ &\equiv -\frac{1}{n+1} y^a K_a^\alpha \partial_\alpha A^{(n)}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.27)$$

where  $\Omega^\alpha$  is generically representing the phase-space coordinates  $(q, p)$  and

$$K_a^\alpha \equiv \omega_{ab} X^{bc} \{T_c, \Omega^\alpha\} \quad (2.28)$$

is a constant matrix. By using expression (2.27) iteratively, we get

$$A^{(n)} = \frac{(-1)^n}{n!} \left( y^a K_a^\alpha \partial_\alpha \right)^n A. \quad (2.29)$$

Introducing (2.29) into (2.15), we obtain  $\tilde{A}$  in terms of  $A$ , namely

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{A}(\Omega, y) &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n}{n!} \left( y^a K_a^\alpha \partial_\alpha \right)^n A, \\ &= \exp \left( -y^a K_a^\alpha \partial_\alpha \right) A. \end{aligned} \quad (2.30)$$

Since  $\exp(-y^a K_a^\alpha \partial_\alpha)$  is a translation operator in the coordinate  $\Omega$ , we have

$$\tilde{A}(\Omega^\alpha, y^a) = A(\Omega^\alpha - y^a K_a^\alpha) \quad (2.31)$$

So, when  $X_{ab}$  do not depend on the phase-space coordinates  $y^\alpha$  and the constraints  $T_a$  are linear in  $\Omega^\alpha$ , the dynamic quantity  $\tilde{A}$  can be directly obtained from  $A$  by replacing  $\Omega^\alpha$  by a shifted coordinate

$$\tilde{\Omega}^\alpha = \Omega^\alpha - y^a K_a^\alpha. \quad (2.32)$$

To conclude this brief report on the BFFT formalism, we refer to the case where there are also first-class constraints in the theory. Let us call them  $F_\alpha$ . We consider that the constraints of the theory satisfy the following involutive algebra (with the use of the Dirac bracket definition to strongly eliminate the second-class constraints)

$$\begin{aligned} \{F_\alpha, F_\beta\}_D &= U_{\alpha\beta}^\gamma F_\gamma + I_{\alpha\beta}^a T_a, \\ \{H_0, F_\alpha\}_D &= V_\alpha^\beta F_\beta + K_\alpha^a T_a, \\ \{F_\alpha, T_b\}_D &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (2.33)$$

In the expressions above,  $U_{\alpha\beta}^\gamma$ ,  $I_{\alpha\beta}^a$ ,  $V_\alpha^\beta$  and  $K_\alpha^a$  are structure functions of the involutive algebra.

The BFFT procedure in this case also introduces one auxiliary variable for each one of the second-class constraints (this is also in agreement with the counting of the physical degrees of freedom of the initial theory). All the constraints and the Hamiltonian have to be properly modified in order to satisfy the same involutive algebra above, namely,

$$\begin{aligned}
\{\tilde{F}_\alpha, \tilde{F}_\beta\} &= U_{\alpha\beta}^\gamma \tilde{F}_\gamma + I_{\alpha\beta}^a \tilde{T}_a, \\
\{\tilde{H}_0, \tilde{F}_\alpha\} &= V_\alpha^\beta \tilde{F}_\beta + K_\alpha^a \tilde{T}_a, \\
\{\tilde{F}_\alpha, \tilde{T}_b\} &= 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.34}$$

Since the algebra is now weakly involutive, the iterative calculation of the previous case cannot be applied here. We have to figure out the corrections that have to be done in the initial quantities. For details, see ref. [2].

### 3 An example in N=1 supersymmetry

Let us discuss here a simple model developed on a parameter space with just one Grassmannian variable. The supersymmetry transformations are defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta t &= i\epsilon\theta, \\
\delta\theta &= \epsilon,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

where  $\epsilon$  is a constant anticommuting parameter that characterizes the supersymmetry transformations (in this section we consider both  $\theta$  and  $\epsilon$  as real quantities).

The transformations above can be expressed in terms of a supersymmetric  $Q$ -generator as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta t &= (\epsilon Q)t, \\
\delta\theta &= (\epsilon Q)\theta.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

The combination of (3.1) and (3.2) permit us to directly infer that

$$Q = \frac{\partial}{\partial\theta} + i\theta \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \tag{3.3}$$

and  $Q$  satisfies the anticommuting algebra

$$[Q, Q]_+ = 2i \frac{\partial}{\partial t}. \tag{3.4}$$

In this space, a (real) supercoordinate has the general form

$$\phi^i(t, \theta) = q^i(t) + i\theta \psi^i(t), \tag{3.5}$$

where  $q^i$  are bosonic coordinates and  $\psi^i$  are fermionic ones. The index  $i$  ( $i = 1, \dots, N$ ) corresponds to the dimension of the configuration space. The quantity  $\phi^i$  given by (3.5) is actually a supercoordinates if it satisfies the supersymmetry transformation

$$\delta\phi^i = (\epsilon Q) \phi^i. \quad (3.6)$$

The combination of (3.3), (3.5), and (3.6) yields the transformation laws for the component fields, namely

$$\begin{aligned} \delta q^i &= i\epsilon \psi^i, \\ \delta \psi^i &= -\epsilon \dot{q}^i. \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

Theories that are expressed in terms of supercoordinates and operators that commute or anticommute with  $Q$  are manifestly supersymmetric invariant. An operator which anticommutes with  $Q$  is

$$D = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} - i\theta \frac{\partial}{\partial t}. \quad (3.8)$$

In order to construct supersymmetric Lagrangians, it is necessary to introduce another operator. Here, this is nothing other than the time derivative. For questions of hermicity, we conveniently write

$$D_t = i \frac{\partial}{\partial t}. \quad (3.9)$$

We then consider the Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2} D_t \phi^i D \phi^i, \quad (3.10)$$

that in terms of components gives

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{2} \dot{q}^i \psi^i + \frac{1}{2} \theta (\dot{q}^i \dot{q}^i - i \dot{\psi}^i \psi^i). \quad (3.11)$$

The  $\theta$ -component of the Lagrangian above transforms as a total derivative. So, it is considered to be the Lagrangian in terms of the component coordinate, namely

$$L = \frac{1}{2} \dot{q}^i \dot{q}^i - \frac{i}{2} \dot{\psi}^i \psi^i. \quad (3.12)$$

In order to identify the constraints, we calculate the canonical momenta

$$\begin{aligned}
p^i &= \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{q}^i} = \dot{q}^i, \\
\pi^i &= \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{\psi}^i} = -\frac{i}{2} \psi^i,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

where we have used left derivative for fermionic coordinates. We notice that the second relation above is a constraint, that we write as

$$T^i = \pi^i + \frac{i}{2} \psi^i \approx 0, \tag{3.14}$$

where  $\approx$  means weakly equal [3]. This is the only constraint of the theory and it is second-class. Its Poisson bracket relation reads

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta &= \{T^i, T^j\}, \\
&= -i \delta^{ij}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

The implementation of the BFFT formalism requires the introduction of auxiliary variables  $\xi^i$  (one for each second-class constraint  $T^i$ ). This coordinate is fermionic because the corresponding constraint is also fermionic. Since there is just one kind of auxiliary coordinates, we have to assume that they are constrained. This is so in order to obtain strong first-class constraints. We then consider

$$\omega^{ij} = \{\xi^i, \xi^j\} = -i \delta^{ij}. \tag{3.16}$$

For this particular example, we do not need to go into details in the BFFT formalism to conclude that the first class constraints  $\tilde{T}^i$  are given by

$$\tilde{T}^i = \pi^i + \frac{i}{2} \psi^i + i \xi^i \approx 0. \tag{3.17}$$

Further, it is also immediately seen that the Lagrangian that leads to this theory reads

$$L = \frac{1}{2} \dot{q}^i \dot{q}^i - \frac{i}{2} \dot{\psi}^i \psi^i - i \dot{\xi}^i \xi^i + i \xi^i \dot{\psi}^i. \tag{3.18}$$

We observe that it will be supersymmetric invariant in the sense of the following transformations

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta q^i &= i \epsilon (\psi^i + 2\xi^i), \\
\delta \psi^i &= \epsilon \dot{q}^i, \\
\delta \xi^i &= -\epsilon \dot{q}^i.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

This is a very simple model and of course cannot tell us everything about the BFFT formalism for supersymmetric theories. But it is important to emphasize that the obtained effective theory is also constrained in the auxiliary variables. If we would like to go on with the BFFT method, we would have to introduce new auxiliary variables to take care of these new constraints. It is easily seen that these new variables would also have to be constrained and that this procedure would lead to an endless process, with an infinite number of auxiliary variables. We shall see that this characteristic will also be manifested in the example we shall discuss in the next section.

## 4 An example with N=2 supersymmetry

Let us here consider the same supersymmetric quantum mechanical system discussed in ref. [10]. It is developed in a space containing two Grassmannian variables,  $\theta$  and  $\bar{\theta}$ . The supersymmetry transformations are defined by

$$\begin{aligned}\delta t &= i\bar{\epsilon}\theta + i\epsilon\bar{\theta}, \\ \delta\theta &= \epsilon, \\ \delta\bar{\theta} &= \bar{\epsilon},\end{aligned}\tag{4.1}$$

where in this section we use the following convention for complex conjugation:  $\theta^* = \bar{\theta}$  and  $\epsilon^* = \bar{\epsilon}$ . There are two supersymmetric generators,  $Q$  and  $\bar{Q}$ , defined by

$$\begin{aligned}\delta t &= (\epsilon Q + \bar{\epsilon}\bar{Q})t, \\ \delta\theta &= (\epsilon Q)\theta, \\ \delta\bar{\theta} &= (\bar{\epsilon}\bar{Q})\bar{\theta}.\end{aligned}\tag{4.2}$$

From (4.1) and (4.2) one can directly infer

$$\begin{aligned}Q &= \frac{\partial}{\partial\theta} + i\bar{\theta}\frac{\partial}{\partial t}, \\ \bar{Q} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial\bar{\theta}} + i\theta\frac{\partial}{\partial t}.\end{aligned}\tag{4.3}$$

These operators satisfy the algebra

$$\begin{aligned}[Q, \bar{Q}]_+ &= 2i\frac{\partial}{\partial t}, \\ [Q, Q]_+ &= 0 = [\bar{Q}, \bar{Q}]_+.\end{aligned}\tag{4.4}$$

Here, the (real) supercoordinate acquires the form

$$\phi^i(t, \theta, \bar{\theta}) = q^i(t) + i\theta \psi^i(t) + i\bar{\theta} \bar{\psi}^i(t) + \bar{\theta}\theta d^i(t), \quad (4.5)$$

that must satisfy the supersymmetry transformation

$$\delta\phi^i = (\epsilon Q + \bar{\epsilon}\bar{Q})\phi^i. \quad (4.6)$$

The coordinates  $\psi^i$  and  $\bar{\psi}^i$  have the same complex conjugation as  $\theta$  and  $\bar{\theta}$ . The combination of (4.3), (4.5) and (4.6) gives the following transformation for the component coordinates:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta q^i &= i(\epsilon\psi^i + \bar{\epsilon}\bar{\psi}^i), \\ \delta\psi^i &= -\bar{\epsilon}(\dot{q}^i - i d^i), \\ \delta\bar{\psi}^i &= -\epsilon(\dot{q}^i + i d^i), \\ \delta d^i &= \bar{\epsilon}\dot{\bar{\psi}}^i - \epsilon\dot{\psi}^i. \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

There are two operators that anticommute with  $Q$  and  $\bar{Q}$ , which are

$$\begin{aligned} D &= \frac{\partial}{\partial\theta} - i\bar{\theta}\frac{\partial}{\partial t}, \\ \bar{D} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial\bar{\theta}} - i\theta\frac{\partial}{\partial t}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

With these operators and the supercoordinates we may construct the following general Lagrangian density

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2}\bar{D}\phi^i D\phi^i - V(\phi). \quad (4.9)$$

The component Lagrangian is obtained by taking the  $\bar{\theta}\theta$  part of the Lagrangian above. The result is

$$L = \frac{1}{2}\dot{q}^i\dot{q}^i + i\bar{\psi}^i\dot{\psi}^i + \frac{1}{2}d^i d^i - d^i \frac{\partial v}{\partial q^i} + \psi^i \bar{\psi}^j \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial q^i \partial q^j}, \quad (4.10)$$

where  $v = V(q)$ . The canonical momenta conjugate to  $q^i$ ,  $d^i$ ,  $\psi^i$  and  $\bar{\psi}^i$  are given respectively by

$$\begin{aligned}
p^i &= \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{q}^i} = \dot{q}^i, \\
s^i &= \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{d}^i} = 0, \\
\pi^i &= \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{\psi}^i} = -i\bar{\psi}^i, \\
\bar{\pi}^i &= \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{\bar{\psi}}^i} = 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

From these equations, one identifies the constraints

$$\begin{aligned}
T_1^i &= \pi^i + i\bar{\psi}^i \approx 0, \\
T_2^i &= \bar{\pi}^i \approx 0, \\
T_3^i &= s^i \approx 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

Constructing the total Hamiltonian and imposing the consistency condition that constraints do not evolve in time [3] we get a new constraint

$$T_4^i = d^i - \frac{\partial v}{\partial q^i} \approx 0, \tag{4.13}$$

We observe that it is the equation of motion with respect the coordinates  $d^i$ . We also mention that there are no more constraints.

These all constraints are second-class. The matrix elements of their Poisson brackets read

$$\begin{aligned}
(\Delta^{ij})_{12} &= -i\delta^{ij}, \\
&= (\Delta^{ij})_{21}, \\
(\Delta^{ij})_{34} &= -\delta^{ij}, \\
&= -(\Delta^{ij})_{43}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.14}$$

Other elements are zero.

To implement the BFFT formalism, we introduce auxiliary coordinates, one for each second-class constraint. Let us generically denote them by  $y^{ai}$ , where  $a = 1, 2, 3, 4$ . These are anticommuting coordinates for  $a = 1, 2$  and commuting for  $a = 3, 4$ .

Here, contrarily to the previous example, the number of constraints is even. So, it is natural that we try to start by supposing that the new variables are canonical

and that there are no constraints involving them. If we proceeded in this way, we would actually get a final theory with just first-class constraints, but it would not be supersymmetric. In fact, we mention that it would be completely inconsistent (see appendix). Also here we have to consider that the fermionic coordinates are not canonical (but there is no problem concerning the bosonic sector) in order to get a final theory also supersymmetric. Let us particularly choose

$$y^{ai} = (\xi^i, \bar{\xi}^i; \eta^i, \rho^i). \quad (4.15)$$

We shall consider the following bracket structure among these variables

$$\begin{aligned} \{\xi^i, \bar{\xi}^j\} &= -i \delta^{ij}, \\ \{\eta^i, \rho^j\} &= \delta^{ij}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.16)$$

Other brackets are zero. We notice that we have considered that  $\rho^i$  are the canonical momenta conjugate to  $\eta^i$ . With these elements, the matrix  $\omega$  defined at (2.2) reads

$$[(\omega^{ij})^{ab}] = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i & 0 & 0 \\ -i & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \delta^{ij}, \quad (4.17)$$

where rows and columns follow the order  $\xi, \bar{\xi}, \eta$ , and  $\rho$ .

Introducing this result into eq. (2.12), as well as the ones given by (4.14), and considering that coefficients  $(X^{ij})_{ab}$  are bosonic for the combinations  $(a = 1, 2; b = 1, 2)$  and  $(a = 3, 4; b = 3, 4)$ , and fermionic for  $(a = 1, 2; b = 3, 4)$  and  $(a = 3, 4; b = 1, 2)$ , we obtain the following independent equations

$$\begin{aligned} i\delta^{ij} + i(X^{ik})_{11}(X^{jk})_{22} + i(X^{ik})_{12}(X^{jk})_{21} &- (X^{ik})_{13}(X^{jk})_{24} \\ &+ (X^{ik})_{14}(X^{jk})_{23} = 0, \\ \delta^{ij} + i(X^{ik})_{31}(X^{jk})_{42} + i(X^{ik})_{32}(X^{jk})_{41} &- (X^{ik})_{33}(X^{jk})_{44} \\ &+ (X^{ik})_{34}(X^{jk})_{43} = 0, \\ i(X^{ik})_{11}(X^{jk})_{32} + i(X^{ik})_{12}(X^{jk})_{31} &- (X^{ik})_{13}(X^{jk})_{34} \\ &+ (X^{ik})_{14}(X^{jk})_{33} = 0, \\ i(X^{ik})_{11}(X^{jk})_{42} + i(X^{ik})_{12}(X^{jk})_{41} &- (X^{ik})_{13}(X^{jk})_{44} \\ &+ (X^{ik})_{14}(X^{jk})_{43} = 0, \\ i(X^{ik})_{21}(X^{jk})_{32} + i(X^{ik})_{22}(X^{jk})_{31} &- (X^{ik})_{23}(X^{jk})_{34} \\ &+ (X^{ik})_{24}(X^{jk})_{33} = 0, \\ i(X^{ik})_{21}(X^{jk})_{42} + i(X^{ik})_{22}(X^{jk})_{41} &- (X^{ik})_{23}(X^{jk})_{44} \\ &+ (X^{ik})_{24}(X^{jk})_{43} = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (4.18)$$

The set of equations above does not univocally fix  $(X^{ij})_{ab}$ . There are less equations than variables. We are then free to choose some of these coefficients in a convenient way. First, we notice that it is a good simplification to consider them bosonic. We thus take equal to zero the fermionic ones, i.e.

$$(X^{ij})_{ab} = 0 \quad \text{for } (a = 1, 2; b = 3, 4) \text{ and } (a = 3, 4; b = 1, 2). \quad (4.19)$$

With this choice, the set of equations above simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned} \delta^{ij} + (X^{ik})_{11}(X^{jk})_{22} + (X^{ik})_{12}(X^{jk})_{21} &= 0, \\ \delta^{ij} - (X^{ik})_{33}(X^{jk})_{44} + (X^{ik})_{34}(X^{jk})_{43} &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (4.20)$$

Looking at the expressions of the constraints  $T_a^i$ , we notice que a choice that might preserve the supersymmetry is

$$\begin{aligned} (X^{ij})_{12} &= i \delta^{ij}, \\ (X^{ij})_{21} &= i \delta^{ij}, \\ (X^{ij})_{11} &= 0 = (X^{ij})_{22}, \\ (X^{ij})_{34} &= -\delta^{ij}, \\ (X^{ij})_{43} &= \delta^{ij}, \\ (X^{ij})_{33} &= 0 = (X^{ij})_{44}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.21)$$

because this would lead to convenient translations in the old coordinates. Since it was possible to obtain the quantities  $X$ 's independently of the phase space coordinates, we have that  $T^{(1)}$ , given by (2.11), is the entire contribution for  $\tilde{T}$ . Then the set of new constraints reads

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{T}_1^i &= \pi^i + i \bar{\psi}^i + i \bar{\xi}^i, \\ \tilde{T}_2^i &= \bar{\pi}^i + i \xi^i, \\ \tilde{T}_3^i &= s^i - \rho^i, \\ \tilde{T}_4^i &= d^i - \frac{\partial v}{\partial q^i} + \eta^i. \end{aligned} \quad (4.22)$$

Notice that the choice of the coefficients  $X$ 's were made such that the auxiliary coordinates  $\bar{\xi}^i$  and  $\eta^i$  figure as translations of  $\bar{\psi}^i$  and  $d^i$  respectively. This will make easier our goal of obtaining a final supersymmetric theory.

The next step is to look for the Lagrangian that leads to this new theory. A consistently way of doing this is by means of the path integral formalism, where the

Faddeev-Senjanovic procedure [11] has to be used. Let us then obtain the canonical Hamiltonian of the initial theory. We first write down the total Hamiltonian

$$H = \dot{q}^i p^i + \dot{d}^i s^i + \dot{\psi}^i \pi + \dot{\bar{\psi}}^i \bar{\pi}^i - L + \lambda_a T_a. \quad (4.23)$$

The order of velocities and momenta (mainly for the Grassmannian coordinates) is due to the left derivative convention. Using the first equation (4.11), one eliminates the velocities  $\dot{q}^i$ . The remaining ones are eliminated by just redefining some Lagrange multipliers. The final result reads

$$H = \frac{1}{2} p^i p^i - \frac{1}{2} d^i d^i + d^i \frac{\partial v}{\partial q^i} + \bar{\psi}^i \psi^j \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial q^i \partial q^j} + \bar{\lambda}_1^i (\pi^i + i \bar{\psi}^i) + \bar{\lambda}_2^i \bar{\pi}^i + \bar{\lambda}_3^i s^i + \lambda_4^i (d^i - \frac{\partial v}{\partial q^i}), \quad (4.24)$$

where  $\bar{\lambda}$ 's are the redefined Lagrange multipliers. From the expression above one can identify the initial canonical Hamiltonian

$$H_c = \frac{1}{2} p^i p^i - \frac{1}{2} d^i d^i + d^i \frac{\partial v}{\partial q^i} + \bar{\psi}^i \psi^j \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial q^i \partial q^j}. \quad (4.25)$$

To calculate the modified Hamiltonian we can use relations (2.15) and (2.24), where  $(\omega^{ij})_{ab}$  is the inverse of (4.17) and  $(X^{ij})^{ab}$  is the inverse of the matrix formed by relations (4.21). On the other hand, it is just a matter of algebraic calculation to obtain the quantities  $G_a^{(n)i}$ , defined by (2.25). The result is

$$\begin{aligned} G_1^{(0)i} &= \bar{\psi}^j \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial q^i \partial q^j}, \\ G_2^{(0)i} &= -\psi^j \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial q^i \partial q^j}, \\ G_3^{(0)i} &= d^i - \frac{\partial v}{\partial q^i}, \\ G_4^{(0)i} &= -p^j \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial q^i \partial q^j}, \\ G_1^{(1)i} &= \bar{\xi}^j \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial q^i \partial q^j}, \\ G_2^{(1)i} &= -\xi^j \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial q^i \partial q^j}, \\ G_3^{(1)i} &= \eta^i, \\ G_4^{(1)i} &= -\rho^j \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial q^i \partial q^k} \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial q^j \partial q^k}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.26)$$

Using these quantities, we obtain the extended canonical Hamiltonian

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{H}_c &= H_c + H_c^{(1)} + H_c^{(2)} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} p^i p^i - \frac{1}{2} d^i d^i - \frac{1}{2} \eta^i \eta^i - d^i \eta^i + (d^i + \eta^i) \frac{\partial v}{\partial q^i} \\
&\quad + \left( \bar{\psi}^i \psi^j + \bar{\xi}^i \xi^j + \bar{\xi}^i \psi^j + \bar{\psi}^i \xi^j + \rho^i p^j \right) \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial q^i \partial q^j} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \rho^i \rho^j \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial q^i \partial q^k} \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial q^j \partial q^k} .
\end{aligned} \tag{4.27}$$

Since the quantities  $(X^{ij})_{ab}$  do not depend on the initial phase-space coordinates, we can check the result above by considering the extended Hamiltonian (4.27) could also have been obtained from shifted coordinates defined in (2.32), i.e.,

$$\tilde{H}_c(\Omega, y) = H_c(\tilde{\Omega}) . \tag{4.28}$$

The calculation of the shifted coordinates gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{q}^i &= q^i , \\
\tilde{p}^i &= p^i + \rho^j \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial q^i \partial q^j} , \\
\tilde{d}^i &= d^i + \eta^i , \\
\tilde{s}^i &= s^i - \rho^i , \\
\tilde{\psi}^i &= \psi^i + \xi^i , \\
\tilde{\bar{\psi}}^i &= \bar{\psi}^i + \bar{\xi}^i , \\
\tilde{\pi}^i &= \pi^i , \\
\tilde{\bar{\pi}}^i &= \bar{\pi}^i + i \xi^i .
\end{aligned} \tag{4.29}$$

Notice once more that the choice we have made for the  $X$ 's quantities at (4.21) led to convenient shifts in the old coordinates. We shall see that this will be very important to demonstrate de supersymmetry invariance of the final theory. It is just a matter of algebraic calculation to show that the combination of (4.28) and (4.29) gives the extended canonical Hamiltonian (4.27).

To use the path integral formalism to obtain the Lagrangian that leads to this theory we have to pay attention for the fact that there are constraints with respect the auxiliary variables  $\xi^i$  and  $\bar{\xi}^i$ . It is not difficult to see that a possible set of constraints is

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi_{\xi}^i &= -i \bar{\xi}^i , \\
\pi_{\bar{\xi}}^i &= 0 .
\end{aligned} \tag{4.30}$$

The general expression for the propagator reads

$$Z = N \int [d\mu] \exp \left\{ i \int_{t_0}^t dt \left( \dot{q}^i p^i + \dot{d}^i s^i + \dot{\psi}^i \pi^i + \dot{\bar{\psi}}^i \bar{\pi}^i + \dot{\eta}^i \rho^i + \dot{\xi}^i \pi_\xi^i + \dot{\bar{\xi}}^i \bar{\pi}_\xi^i - \tilde{H}_c \right) \right\}, \quad (4.31)$$

with the measure  $[d\mu]$  given by

$$[d\mu] = [dq][dp][dd][ds][d\psi][d\bar{\psi}][d\pi][d\bar{\pi}][d\xi][d\bar{\xi}][d\eta][d\rho][d\pi_\xi][d\bar{\pi}_\xi] \\ |\det \{, \}| \delta [\pi_\xi^i + i\bar{\xi}^i] \delta [\pi_\xi^i] \prod_a \delta [\tilde{T}_a] \delta [\tilde{\Lambda}_a], \quad (4.32)$$

where  $\tilde{\Lambda}_a$  are gauge-fixing functions corresponding to the first-class constraints  $\tilde{T}_a$  and the term  $|\det \{, \}|$  represents the determinant of all constraints of the theory, including the gauge-fixing ones. The quantity  $N$  that appears in (4.32) is the usual normalization factor. Using the delta functions, we can directly eliminate momenta  $\pi^i$ ,  $\bar{\pi}^i$ ,  $s^i$ ,  $\pi_\xi^i$ , and  $\bar{\pi}_\xi^i$ . The result is

$$Z = N \int [dq][dp][dd][d\psi][d\bar{\psi}][d\xi][d\bar{\xi}][d\eta][d\rho] |\det \{, \}| \delta [\tilde{T}_4] \prod_a \delta [\tilde{\Lambda}_a] \\ \exp \left\{ i \int_{t_0}^t dt \left[ \dot{q}^i p^i + (\dot{d}^i + \dot{\eta}^i) \rho^i - \frac{1}{2} p^i p^i + \frac{1}{2} d^i d^i + \frac{1}{2} \eta^i \eta^i + \eta^i d^i \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. - i (\dot{\bar{\psi}}^i \psi^i + \dot{\xi}^i \xi^i + \dot{\bar{\psi}}^i \xi^i + \dot{\xi}^i \psi^i) \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. - (\bar{\psi}^i \psi^j + \bar{\xi}^i \psi^j + \bar{\psi}^i \xi^j + \bar{\xi}^i \xi^j + \rho^i p^j) \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial q^i \partial q^j} \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. - \frac{1}{2} \rho^i \rho^j \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial q^i \partial q^k} \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial q^k \partial q^j} \right] \right\}. \quad (4.33)$$

Finally, integrating over  $p^i$  and  $\rho^i$  we obtain

$$Z = N \int [dq][dd][d\psi][d\bar{\psi}][d\xi][d\bar{\xi}][d\eta] |\det \{, \}| \delta [\dot{d}^i + \dot{\eta}^i - \dot{q}^j \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial q^i \partial q^j}] \\ \delta [\tilde{T}_4] \prod_a \delta [\tilde{\Lambda}_a] \exp \left\{ i \int_{t_0}^t dt \left[ \frac{1}{2} \dot{q}^i \dot{q}^i + \frac{1}{2} d^i d^i + \frac{1}{2} \eta^i \eta^i + \eta^i d^i \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. - (d^i + \eta^i) \frac{\partial v}{\partial q^i} - i (\dot{\bar{\psi}}^i \psi^i + \dot{\xi}^i \xi^i + \dot{\bar{\psi}}^i \xi^i + \dot{\xi}^i \psi^i) \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. - (\bar{\psi}^i \psi^j + \bar{\xi}^i \psi^j + \bar{\psi}^i \xi^j + \bar{\xi}^i \xi^j) \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial q^i \partial q^j} \right] \right\}, \quad (4.34)$$

where the new  $\delta$ -function above came from the integrations over  $\rho^i$ . We notice that it is nothing other than the time derivative of constraint  $\tilde{T}_4$ . It is then just a consistency condition and does not represent any new restriction over the coordinates of the theory.

From the propagator (4.34), we identify the extended Lagrangian

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{L} = & \frac{1}{2} \dot{q}^i \dot{q}^i + \frac{1}{2} d^i d^i + \frac{1}{2} \eta^i \eta^i + \eta^i d^i - (d^i + \eta^i) \frac{\partial v}{\partial q^i} \\
& - i (\dot{\bar{\psi}}^i \psi^i + \dot{\bar{\xi}}^i \xi^i + \dot{\bar{\psi}}^i \xi^i + \dot{\bar{\xi}}^i \psi^i) \\
& - (\bar{\psi}^i \psi^j + \bar{\psi}^i \xi^j + \bar{\xi}^i \psi^j + \bar{\xi}^i \xi^j) \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial q^i \partial q^j}
\end{aligned} \tag{4.35}$$

The Lagrangian above is supersymmetric invariant if we consider the transformations

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta q^i &= i [\epsilon (\psi^i + \xi^i) + \bar{\epsilon} (\bar{\psi}^i + \bar{\xi}^i)], \\
\delta \psi^i &= -\bar{\epsilon} (\dot{q}^i - i d^i), \\
\delta \bar{\psi}^i &= -\epsilon (\dot{q}^i + i d^i), \\
\delta d^i &= \bar{\epsilon} \dot{\bar{\psi}}^i - \epsilon \dot{\psi}^i, \\
\delta \xi^i &= i \bar{\epsilon} \eta^i, \\
\delta \bar{\xi}^i &= -i \epsilon \eta^i, \\
\delta \eta^i &= \bar{\epsilon} \dot{\bar{\xi}}^i - \epsilon \dot{\xi}^i.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.36}$$

## 5 Conclusion

We have used the method developed by Batalin, Fradkin, Fradkina, and Tyutin in order to quantize two supersymmetric quantum mechanical models, by transforming second-class into first-class constraints. We have shown that final supersymmetric theories are only achieved by taking constrained auxiliary variables. This procedure leads to an endless process of introducing auxiliary constrained variables and transforming them into first-class ones. This appears to be a general characteristic of the use of the BFFT method in supersymmetric theories.

Although we have just considered supersymmetric quantum mechanical models, the same could be directly done for field theories. Of course, the algebraic work would be much bigger, but these would give no new information comparing what we have already found here.

**Acknowledgment:** This work is supported in part by Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico - CNPq, Financiadora de Estudos e Projetos - FINEP and Fundação Universitária José Bonifácio - FUJB (Brazilian Research Agencies).

## Appendix

Let us discuss in this appendix the result we would obtain if we had considered the two auxiliary fermionic coordinates as non constrained and taken one as the momentum conjugate of the other, say  $\xi^i$  and  $\chi^i$ , satisfying the Poisson bracket relation

$$\{\xi^i, \chi^j\} = -\delta^{ij}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

The matrix  $[(\omega^{ij})^{ab}]$  would be

$$[(\omega^{ij})^{ab}] = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \delta^{ij}. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Also considering the condition (4.19) we would obtain the following equations involving the coefficients  $X$ 's

$$\begin{aligned} i\delta^{ij} + (X^{ik})_{11}(X^{jk})_{22} + (X^{ik})_{12}(X^{jk})_{21} &= 0, \\ \delta^{ij} - (X^{ik})_{33}(X^{jk})_{44} + (X^{ik})_{34}(X^{jk})_{43} &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

and a good choice for  $X$ 's could be (because it leads to translations in the old coordinates)

$$\begin{aligned} (X^{ij})_{11} &= i\delta^{ij}, \\ (X^{ij})_{22} &= -\delta^{ij}, \\ (X^{ij})_{12} &= 0 = (X^{ij})_{21}, \\ (X^{ij})_{34} &= -\delta^{ij}, \\ (X^{ij})_{43} &= \delta^{ij}, \\ (X^{ij})_{33} &= 0 = (X^{ij})_{44}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

The new constraints  $\tilde{T}$  read

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{T}_1^i &= \pi^i + i\bar{\psi}^i + i\xi^i, \\
\tilde{T}_2^i &= \bar{\pi}^i - \chi^i, \\
\tilde{T}_3^i &= s^i - \rho^i, \\
\tilde{T}_4^i &= d^i - \frac{\partial v}{\partial q^i} + \eta^i.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.5}$$

We actually notice that we have chosen  $X$ 's in such a way that  $\xi$  and  $\eta$  appear as translations of the  $\bar{\psi}$  and  $d$ , respectively.

Following the same procedure as before, we obtain the extended Hamiltonian

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{H}_c &= \frac{1}{2} p^i p^i - \frac{1}{2} d^i d^i - \frac{1}{2} \eta^i \eta^i - \eta^i d^i + (d^i + \eta^i) \frac{\partial v}{\partial q^i} \\
&\quad + \left( \bar{\psi}^i \psi^j + i\bar{\psi}^i \chi^j + \xi^i \psi^j + i\xi^i \chi^j + p^i \rho^j \right) \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial q^i \partial q^j} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \rho^i \rho^j \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial q^i \partial q^k} \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial q^k \partial q^j}.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.6}$$

Apparently, there is no problem with this Hamiltonian, but considering the general expression of the propagator and using the  $\delta$  functional to eliminate the momenta  $\pi$ ,  $\bar{\pi}$ , and  $s$ , as well as performing the integration over  $\chi$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
Z &= N \int [dq][dp][dd][d\psi][d\bar{\psi}][d\eta][d\rho][d\xi] |\det \{, \}| \delta[\tilde{T}_4] \prod_a \delta[\tilde{\Lambda}^a] \\
&\quad \delta \left[ \dot{\bar{\psi}}^i + \dot{\xi}^i - i(\bar{\psi}^j + \xi^j) \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial a^i \partial q^j} \right] \exp \left\{ i \int_{t_0}^t dt \left[ \dot{q}^i p^i + \dot{d}^i \rho^i + \dot{\eta}^i \rho^i \right. \right. \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} d^i d^i + \frac{1}{2} \eta^i \eta^i + d^i \eta^i - (d^i + \eta^i) \frac{\partial v}{\partial q^i} \\
&\quad + i \psi^i \left( \dot{\bar{\psi}}^i + \dot{\xi}^i - i(\bar{\psi}^j + \xi^j) \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial q^i \partial q^j} \right) \\
&\quad \left. \left. - \frac{1}{2} \left( p^i + \rho^j \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial a^i \partial q^j} \right) \left( p^i + \rho^k \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial a^i \partial q^k} \right) \right] \right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.7}$$

The  $\delta$  function that appear into the expression above was obtained after integrating over  $\chi$ . We notice that the constraint imposed by this  $\delta$  function is not a consistency condition for other constraints, as occurred with the  $\delta$ -function that appears in (4.35). More than that, we also notice that it causes the elimination of all terms with  $\psi$  and  $\bar{\psi}$  in the propagator. Consequently, this would lead to a final effective Lagrangian without these variables, what is obviously a non consistent result because it does not matches the initial theory when the auxiliary fields are

turned off. It is also important to emphasize that this result is not related to the particular choice we have made for the coefficients  $X$ 's given at (A.5). We mention that this kind of inconsistency would persist for any choice we make for  $X$ 's in equations (A.3).

## References

- [1] I.A. Batalin and E.S. Fradkin, Phys. Lett. B180 (1986) 157; Nucl. Phys. B279 (1987) 514; I.A. Batalin, E.S. Fradkin, and T.E. Fradkina, *ibid.* B314 (1989) 158; B323 (1989) 734.
- [2] I.A. Batalin and I.V. Tyutin, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A6 (1991) 3255.
- [3] P.A.M. Dirac, Can. J. Math. 2 (1950) 129; *Lectures on quantum mechanics* (Yeshiva University, New York, 1964).
- [4] M.B. Green and J.H. Schwarz, Phys. Lett. B136 (1984) 367; Nucl. Phys. B243 (1984) 285. For an in-depth review, see M.B. Green, J.H. Schwarz and E. Witten, *Superstring theory* (Cambridge U.P., Cambridge, 1987).
- [5] W. Siegel, Phys. Lett. B128 (1983) 397; Class. Quantum Grav. 2 (1985) L95.
- [6] See, for example, R. Kallosh, Phys. Lett. B195 (1987) 369 and E. Nissimov, S. Pacheva and S. Solomon, Nucl. Phys. B297 (1988) 349.
- [7] R. Amorim and J. Barcelos-Neto, Phys. Lett. B333 (1994) 413; Phys. Rev. D53 (1996) *in press*.
- [8] N. Banerjee, S. Ghosh, and R. Banerjee, Nucl. Phys. B417 (1994) 257; Phys. Rev. D49 (1994) 1996.
- [9] R. Amorim and A. Das, Mod. Phys. Lett. A9 (1994) 3543. R. Amorim, Z. Phys. C67 (1995) 695.
- [10] E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B188 (1981) 513. See also, P. Salomonson and J.W. Van Holten, Nucl. Phys. B196 (1982) 509; S.P. Misra and T. Pattnaik, Phys. Lett. B129 (1983) 401; J. Barcelos-Neto and A. Das, Phys. Rev. D33 (1986) 2863; J. Barcelos-Neto and E.S. Cheb-Terrab, Z. Phys. C54 (1992) 133.
- [11] L.D. Faddeev, Theor. Math. Phys. 1 (1970) 1; P. Senjanovick, Ann. Phys. (NY) 100 (1976) 277.
- [12] E.S. Fradkin and G.A. Vilkovisky, Phys. Lett. B55 (1975) 224; I.A. Batalin and G.A. Vilkovisky, Phys. Lett. B69 (1977) 309.